

SENATOR LABEDZ: Thank you, Mr. President. I oppose what Senator Vard Johnson is trying to do. Senator Vard Johnson started out by saying, I support LB 31 which is the elimination of the ADC program for the unborn child. And I would like to read to you just what he said when this bill was introduced and the decision was to make the ADC payments for the unborn. This is Senator Vard Johnson speaking on the floor of the Legislature. He says, "Our Legislature decided very simply that we were going to go on record as making certain that benefits were available to the mother and the unborn child and that is an absolutely right and correct decision and it is important for us to continue that policy today and forever." Senator Johnson, you said, "and forever", we should continue the policy "today and forever if we genuinely care about the well being of pregnant mothers and the fetuses that they are carrying and I know that we all do." These are Senator Johnson's words. Today he stands up and says, I support LB 31 as amended by the Appropriations Committee and he goes further to try and put LB 201 as an amendment to the amendment and I will oppose that although I support the bill itself. I think LB 201 is on Final Reading. We should consider that at that time and not as an amendment to the committee amendments of LB 31. I will oppose LB 31 in due time, but right now I am opposing Senator Johnson's amendment.

SPEAKER NICHOL: Senator Beutler, please.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a ruling on germaneness.

SPEAKER NICHOL: All right. Did you wish to speak about it or not?

SENATOR BEUTLER: I would just make a couple of comments if I could, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER NICHOL: All right.

SENATOR BEUTLER: First of all, LB 31 which is the committee amendments, the amendment is to the committee amendments that deals with an existing statute of law, 43-504. That particular statute deals only with dependent children and not with society generally. LB 201 deals with society generally as opposed to dependent children and does not deal with that section of the statutes, is similar only in its